

CHAPTER 6 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

The following discussion evaluates alternatives to The Ripcurl project and examines the potential environmental impacts associated with each alternative. Through comparison of these alternatives to the proposed project, the relative environmental advantages and disadvantages of each are weighed and analyzed. The *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA) Guidelines require that the range of alternatives addressed in an EIR be governed by a rule of reason. Not every conceivable alternative must be addressed, nor do infeasible alternatives need to be considered (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6). Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines states that the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, other plans or regulatory limitations, and jurisdictional boundaries. The discussion of alternatives must focus on alternatives capable of either avoiding or substantially lessening any significant environmental effects of the project, even if the alternative would impede, to some degree, the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly. The alternatives discussion should not consider alternatives whose implementation is remote or speculative, and the analysis need not be presented in the same level of detail as the assessment of the project.

6.1 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

To identify reasonable alternatives to The Ripcurl Project, the City, as Lead Agency, considered the objectives of the proposed project. The objectives of the proposed project as identified by the City are as follows:

- Establish zoning standards and implementation mechanisms applicable to mixed-use developments consistent with the policies and development framework of the City's General Plan and Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance to maximize land use opportunities.
- Create a development that is compatible with and sensitive to the existing land uses in the project area.
- Promote residential and commercial buildings that convey a high quality visual image and character.
- Enhance the community image of Huntington Beach through the design and construction of high quality development consistent with the Urban Design Element of the City's General Plan.
- Ensure adequate utility infrastructure and public services for new development.
- Achieve the development of projects that enable residents to live in proximity to their jobs, commercial services, and entertainment, and reduce the need for automobile use.
- Provide for the development of mixed-use projects that integrate residential and commercial uses and ensure compatibility of these uses.
- Mitigate environmental impacts to the greatest extent possible.

Additionally, the objectives of the proposed project, as identified by the Applicant are as follows:

Community Objectives

- Support regional mobility goals by encouraging development in and around current and future potential transportation and activity centers, thereby reducing vehicle trips and infrastructure costs, and encouraging the expansion and improvement of public transportation service.
- Provide local residents and college students, faculty, and staff with a luxury living alternative, and attract high-income renters from other areas whose spending power and consumption habits will provide support for surrounding retail businesses.
- Accommodate demand for Class-A market rate rental housing otherwise unmet in the community.

Development and Site Design Objectives

- Create a high-quality, mixed-use development that offers unique urban living experiences while promoting an active pedestrian environment and access to restaurant and retail uses in the area.
- Maximize utilization of a uniquely located development opportunity by locating density where it is self-mitigating through resident access to campus and transit.
- Provide for the development of an underutilized site and replace the visual blight of existing strip retail with the visual excitement of new, top-rate development.
- Improve the open space environment through the addition of open spaces and increased landscaping including new landscaped podiums and pathways, some of which will be accessible not only to the residents, but also to the public.
- Capitalize on future potential commuter rail service by locating development along the likely route of the Union Pacific rail line.
- Provide parking with direct access to the development.
- Create affordable housing through onsite and directly subsidized offsite units.
- Create a mixed-use development that maximizes opportunities for green building and environmentally sound design.

Economic Objectives

- Maximize the value of the currently underutilized site through the development of new housing and retail uses, consistent with anticipated market demands.
- Accommodate sufficient residential density to make demolition of an operating retail and office asset financially feasible.
- Achieve high retail rents by providing a base of captive on-site customers and a smaller but upgraded offering of establishments.
- Achieve premium apartment rents by meeting the high market demand for housing that is close to retail, office, education, and transportation.
- Accommodate future economic expansion by providing high-density housing and retail within a community that has the necessary infrastructure to support the development.
- Strengthen the economic vitality of the region by attracting new workers, through construction, rehabilitation and operation of the project.

The alternatives that are evaluated in this section include the following:

- **Alternative 1: No Project/No Development Alternative**—In addition to alternative development scenarios, Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires the analyses of a “no

project” alternative. The purpose of examining such an alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the effects of approving the project with the effects on not approving the project. For the purposes of this analysis, the “no project” alternative would serve as a “no development” alternative with the site remaining in its existing condition. This would include the continuation of the existing 30,000 square feet (sf) of retail use and 30,000 sf of office use, with 80 percent occupancy. The existing retailers would remain, with no improvements occurring at the site.

Methodology for Selection of Alternative 1: Section 15126.6(e)(3)(C) of the CEQA Guidelines states that the lead agency should analyze the effects of the no project alternative by evaluating what could reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if no changes were to occur. Therefore, under Alternative 1, the impacts of the proposed project are compared to the impacts that could occur under the existing development. This alternative would result in the continuation of the existing commercial uses on the site and would not involve any improvements at the site.

- **Alternative 2: No Project/Continuation of Uses Allowed By Existing General Plan—** Consistent with Section 15126.6(e)(3)(C) of the CEQA Guidelines, this alternative assumes the site would remain as commercial general (CG-F1-d) as identified in the existing General Plan. However, under this alternative growth could occur through existing permitted development or increased tenant use, as the site is currently 80 percent leased. In general, no new environmental effects would directly result from the selection of this alternative. Maintenance of the project site in its present state would avoid the environmental impacts identified for the proposed project. In general, no significant and adverse environmental impacts directly or cumulatively associated with Alternative 2 are anticipated, although slight increases in traffic resulting from increased tenant occupancy could occur.

Methodology for Selection of Alternative 2: Section 15126.6(e)(3)(C) of the CEQA Guidelines states that the lead agency should analyze the effects of the no project alternative by evaluating what could reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services. Therefore, under Alternative 2, the impacts of the proposed project are compared to the impacts that could occur under the existing, adopted General Plan. This alternative would result in the continuation of the existing commercial uses on the site and would not involve residential uses under this alternative.

- **Alternative 3: Reduced Project Alternative-Option 1—**This alternative assumes a reduced intensity of the project elements at the same project site. Under this alternative, The Ripcurl Project would preserve the planned 440 residential units and eliminate the 10,000 sf of retail use.

Methodology for Selection of Alternative 3: This alternative was selected to reduce the amount of traffic that would be generated by retail use. To achieve this, The Ripcurl Project would be reduced in size, which may result in the site being reconfigured.

- **Alternative 4: Reduced Project Alternative-Option 2—**This alternative assumes a reduced intensity of the project elements on the same project site. Under this alternative, The Ripcurl Project would be reduced to 385 residential units and 8,500 sf of commercial/retail space.

Methodology for Selection of Alternative 4: This alternative was selected to reduce the amount of traffic that would be generated by the project, while still allowing for a mix of uses. To achieve this, The Ripcurl Project would be reduced in size (but would still be more than double the size of the existing commercial uses, to account for existing and anticipated housing needs) and the site may be reconfigured.

6.2 ALTERNATIVES REJECTED AS INFEASIBLE

During the scoping process, other alternatives were also considered, but were found to be infeasible, as described in the following sections.

6.2.1 Alternative Locations/Sites

Given that the City of Huntington Beach is a highly urbanized area, underdeveloped or vacant land parcels of similar size to the project site are limited. Additionally, moving the project to another location would not satisfy many of the project objectives; nor would it reduce significant and unavoidable impacts to traffic conditions. For example, one of the objectives is to support regional mobility goals by placing the site close to transit and activity centers, which thereby limits the potential for alternative locations. No vacant sites would be suitable to provide retail and residential use in close proximity to transit centers like the Golden West Transportation Center while simultaneously serving Golden West College and providing access to regional activity centers like the existing Bella Terra Mall and The Village at Bella Terra, proposed east and south/east of the project site. In addition, there are a number of other project objectives that could not be served at other locations. For example, the project is designed to create a pedestrian-friendly complement to Golden West College by providing resident- and student-serving retail along with providing local density with access to regional freeways, such as I-405. No other feasible locations are available in the City to successfully complete both of these objectives. Therefore, this alternative was rejected as infeasible.

6.3 ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

This section provides an analysis of the environmental impacts of each of the project alternatives, summarized previously in Section 6.1, including a comparison of the potential impacts of the alternative to the proposed project, as well as the impacts that would result from implementation of the project alternatives themselves.

Four alternatives are analyzed in this section, including two No Project Alternatives (No Development and Continuation of Existing Uses.) The No Project/No Development Alternative must be analyzed pursuant to Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines to allow decision-makers to compare the impacts of approving the proposed project with the impacts of not approving the proposed project. The second alternative analyzes a similar No Project Alternative; however, development would be allowed to occur under the existing General Plan Guidelines. The third and fourth alternatives consider reduced project options, either with or without retail. Each of the alternatives was selected because of their potential to avoid or substantially lessen one or more significant impacts of the proposed project such as impacts created to traffic conditions.

6.3.1 Alternative 1: No Project/No Development Alternative

■ Description

As discussed previously, Section 15126.6(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires the analyses of a “no project” alternative. The purpose of examining such an alternative is to allow decision-makers to compare the effects of approving the project with the effects on not approving the project. This “no project” analysis must discuss the existing conditions, as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not to be approved. For a development project (such as The Ripcurl Project), this analysis generally focuses upon the property remaining in its existing state. The No Project/No Development Alternative represents the status quo; the project site would continue with the 60,000 sf of retail and office use, while remaining at 80 percent capacity. Further, the existing tenants would remain unchanged. The vacant space would remain vacant, and the employment levels would remain as they are. No residential uses or improvements to the site would occur.

■ Potential Impacts

In general, no new environmental effects would directly result from the selection of this alternative. Maintenance of the project site in its present state would allow the on-site uses to continue. Recent trends show a decline in patron use of strip malls. As a result, blight could occur at the project site under this alternative. The site would not be developed with new uses, as it is currently developed as a commercial/retail site, and no demolition activities would occur. Traffic effects, in particular those associated with the I-405 Freeway Southbound ramps at Center Avenue that would be significant and unavoidable for the proposed project would be eliminated. No increase in traffic impacts would occur above what currently exists as the site would not include additional uses. The site would remain visually as-is, eliminating changes to the visual character and land uses on site. However, the introduction of a high-density mixed-use project near an existing transit center would also not occur. Although no significant and adverse environmental impacts directly or cumulatively associated with this alternative would occur, it is possible that if continuing uses elicited a sharp decline in patronage of the strip mall, then blight could eventually occur, which could lead to future environmental impacts. However, the analysis of such potential impacts is considered speculative.

■ Attainment of Project Objectives

Under this alternative, the mixed-use project would not be constructed. As a result, only one of the seventeen identified project objectives would be obtained by implementation of this Alternative, as no new retail or residential uses would be developed. While this alternative may result in a reduction of most environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, it would not satisfy the identified project objectives.

6.3.2 Alternative 2: No Project/Continuation of Uses Allowed by Existing General Plan

■ Description

This alternative assumes the development level articulated in the City's General Plan (1996). Currently, the project site has a General Plan designation of CG-F1-d (Commercial General), which establishes a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.35 for the site and a design overlay that permits underlying land uses to be designed in accordance with special design standards. The project site currently has a zoning designation of CG (Commercial General), which provides opportunities for a full range of retail and service businesses and is consistent with the General Plan.

With a project site of 3.8 acres (approximately 165,500 sf), roughly 60,000 sf of commercial use could be developed. Therefore, no additional development would be anticipated to occur on the site as a result of this Alternative. However, under this alternative, the site's tenant vacancy would be reduced to 0 percent, as all available space would be occupied. Further, changes in tenants could occur, which could result in a change in uses and an increase, or decrease, in customers and vehicle traffic. Aesthetics, including lighting and building design, would be anticipated to remain the same.

■ Potential Impacts

As with Alternative 1, this Alternative is not anticipated to result in any new environmental effects. The project site would remain as is, as the existing use represents full build-out of the General Plan. The only environmental impacts that could be anticipated to occur as a result of Alternative 2 would be an increase in traffic, which could result in subsequent air quality and noise impacts. However, full build-out of the project site under the existing General Plan is not anticipated to result in any greater traffic volumes than those anticipated for the proposed project.⁶⁴ As one significant and unavoidable impact relating to traffic volumes was identified for the proposed project (both project-specific and cumulatively), Alternative 2 may also result in a significant environmental impact. However, overall traffic impacts would be less because there would be no construction-related truck trips. Air quality and noise impacts from traffic would be less than that identified for the proposed project because construction activities would not be required to increase tenant occupancy rates.

■ Attainment of Project Objectives

Under this alternative, the mixed-use project would not be constructed. As a result, only one of the seventeen identified project objectives would be obtained by implementation of this Alternative, as no new retail or residential uses would be developed. Similar to Alternative 1, while this Alternative may result in a reduction of most environmental impacts associated with the proposed project, it would not satisfy the identified project objectives.

⁶⁴ Austin-Foust, *Huntington Beach Ripcurl Traffic Impact Analysis*, Table 4-2. July 2008.

6.3.3 Alternative 3: Reduced Project—Option 1

■ Description

This Alternative assumes a reduced intensity of development through an elimination of retail use on the same project site. Under this Alternative, 440 residential units would be developed on the project site. These units would include: 151 studio units, 190 one-bedroom units, 88 two-bedroom units, and 11 live-work lofts. However, unlike the proposed project, Alternative 3 would not include retail use on the site, but the estimated 7,000 sf residential leasing office would remain. Therefore, the Project's overall size would be reduced by 10,000 sf.

Site configuration would be modified to allow the residential units to better fit the site without the inclusion of retail space at the ground level. All features associated with the proposed project (minus the retail) would be included as part of this Alternative, including an outdoor pool and spa area, fire pit, and movie projection area as well as an indoor fitness center, business center, conference room, and clubhouse. Primary access to the parking garage proposed as part of Alternative 3 would be from Center Avenue, with secondary access from Gothard Street.

The Alternative would target three populations groups: (1) Young Professionals, (2) the Golden West College community, and (3) Progressives. Young professionals consist of childless couples and singles who work in Huntington Beach, North Orange County, and South LA County who would be drawn to amenities provided in the proposed neighboring The Village at Bella Terra project, the surrounding neighborhood and the project itself. The Golden West College community consists of students, teachers and administrators associated with the neighboring college who would like to take advantage of new living options close to campus. Progressives consist of people who would utilize transit for work and who would appreciate the green features of the Alternative.

■ Potential Impacts

Aesthetics

This Alternative would result in development of a residential development of similar size and massing as the proposed project, excluding the retail uses. No scenic vistas would be impacted as a result of the Alternative. The four-story residential development would demolish the existing buildings on-site and would replace them with 440 residential units. The Alternative would be taller than the existing on-site structures and would result in changes to the aesthetic character. However, the overall size and design of the Alternative would be in keeping with the surrounding developments. Furthermore, the Alternative's overall size would be slightly less than that proposed under the project, although likely not to a noticeable degree visually. All parking and utilities required under the Alternative would be screened from public view, similar to the proposed project and color and architectural design would be approved by the City. Because structures under this Alternative would be the same height as the structures under the proposed project, this Alternative would cast similar shadows on adjacent structures as the proposed project. As such, visual impacts under this alternative would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Impacts associated with light and glare would also be similar to the proposed project, because interior and exterior artificial light would be necessary, and exterior-building materials would be identical to the proposed project. The only difference would be the elimination of retail space at the corner of Center Avenue and Gothard Street, which could reduce the amount of exterior lighting required along this portion of the project site. These impacts would remain less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Overall, aesthetic impacts anticipated under this Alternative would be similar to the proposed project, although slightly less due to potentially fewer exterior nighttime lighting requirements, and would be less than significant.

Air Quality

Implementation of this Alternative would require demolition of on-site structures and construction of residential units, similar to the proposed project. Although the construction impacts of Alternative 3 would be less than that identified for the proposed project, the City requirements and mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would apply to Alternative 3 as well. This Alternative eliminates all the retail associated with the proposed project, which effectively eliminates 10,000 sf of retail space. As such, the amount of air pollutant emissions (i.e., CO, VOC, NO_x, SO_x, and PM₁₀) generated by motor vehicles and daily operation of the site would be similar to, but slightly less than the proposed project and SCAQMD thresholds, and would remain less than significant.

Like the proposed project, construction activities associated with this alternative would include grading and compaction of the on-site soil, building construction, application of architectural coating to the interior and exterior of the new structures, and application of new asphalt. Compliance with the identified City requirements and implementation of identified mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. As the footprint of development would be smaller, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

Construction of this alternative would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations due to project-generated toxic air contaminants. Although construction activities typically generate emissions of toxic air contaminants (e.g., diesel emissions, fumes from paint and solvents), neither the amount of these emissions or the location of such emissions would result in substantial exposure for sensitive receptors in the project vicinity. This impact would be less than significant.

Construction activities associated with this alternative would not generate emissions that would result in an exceedance of localized significance thresholds established by the SCAQMD. This impact would be less than significant. As less development would take place under this alternative, impacts would be less than under the proposed project.

Alternative 3 does not have a commercial component, and therefore, emissions generated during operation of only residential uses would be less than the operation of both residential and commercial uses at the site. Similar to the proposed project, operation of the uses prescribed under this alternative would not generate emissions that would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. As the development would be

less intense than the proposed project and would likely generate lesser traffic volumes, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

Operation of this alternative would generate increased local traffic volumes but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial localized carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations. Although traffic volumes would increase beyond existing levels at local intersections, the ARB has projected reduced future vehicle emissions factors for CO resulting from anticipated improvements in emissions technologies, and localized CO emissions would not exceed applicable federal or state standards. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Construction and operation of this alternative would not create objectionable odors, from either construction activities or daily operation affecting a substantial number of people, as the distance between the site and adjacent land uses would ensure that any such odors would dissipate. This impact would be less than significant.

Similar to the proposed project and based on the other known area projects, construction and operation of this alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards. As the development would be less intense than the proposed project and would likely generate lesser traffic volumes, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

Overall, air quality impacts anticipated under this Alternative would be similar to, but slightly less than the proposed project.

Biological Resources

The project site does not contain riparian habitats, wetlands, or sensitive species, and there is no adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan that covers the project site. Further, the project site is located within a fully urbanized and developed City, and does not contain a wildlife corridor or other biological resource of importance to the region. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, Alternative 3 would result in no impacts for these thresholds. Similar to the proposed project, implementation of Alternative 3 could have a direct or indirect impact on habitat loss in the area, specifically for nesting birds. However, the implementation of the identified mitigation measure (MM4.3-1 for the proposed project) would ensure that this impact remains less than significant. Therefore, Alternative 3 would have a similar impact as the proposed project with respect to habitat loss. Additionally, Alternative 3 would not interfere with or impact the implementation of any City, State, or federal policies or ordinances that would apply to biological resources, similar to the proposed project. Overall, the impacts of this Alternative on biological resources would be similar to the impacts of the proposed project and would be less than significant.

Cultural Resources

Both the proposed project and Alternative 3 would demolish the existing on-site buildings and construct improved developments on the site, which could potentially disturb previously unknown cultural resources, including human remains. This would occur specifically during the grading and trenching

phases of construction, as the Alternative would involve an underground parking structure. Despite the reduction in project size (elimination of 10,000 sf of retail), the Alternative would result in grading of the entire site. Project requirements and mitigation measures incorporated into the proposed project would ensure that this impact would be less than significant. Alternative 3 would be required to adhere to the policies of the General Plan and Municipal Code requirements with regard to cultural resources as well as those measures identified for the proposed project, and impacts from Alternative 3 would similarly be less than significant.

Geology and Soils

Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative could expose people and/or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects resulting from strong seismic groundshaking or seismic-related ground failure. All impacts associated with geological and soil impacts that were identified for the proposed project would also apply to Alternative 3. Construction and building of the residential units would follow all established policies and codes. Therefore, impacts associated with geology and soils would be similar to the proposed project and would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Similar to the proposed project, this alternative could expose people and/or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects resulting from strong seismic groundshaking or seismic-related ground failure. Through compliance with federal, State, and local regulations related to seismic safety, this impact would remain less than significant. The risks to people and structures would not be increased regardless of the size of the development, as adherence to these regulations would assure seismic safety to the greatest extent possible. Therefore, impacts due to seismic activity would be less than significant. This alternative could result in soil erosion, but would not result in the loss of topsoil. As part of the project, a site-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, which is part of the NPDES Municipal General Permit, would be prepared for development under this alternative. Compliance with applicable requirements would ensure that this impact remain less than significant.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Although the intensity of development under Alternative 3 would be less than that identified for the proposed project, potential impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials would be similar. Construction of Alternative 3 would involve the use of hazardous materials, specifically in the form of diesel fuel. Project construction could expose construction workers to significant health and safety hazards through earthmoving activities that could result in the release of hazardous materials to the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions. Implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, similar to the proposed project. Operation of the residential uses for Alternative 3 could involve the use of hazardous materials in the form of basic household cleaning materials and landscaping chemicals. Overall, Alternative 3 would result in similar impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality

With respect to hydrology and water quality, impacts associated with Alternative 3 would be similar to those identified for the proposed project. Alternative 3 would develop the Project site with 440 residential units as well as a parking garage for residents and visitors. Although the Alternative would not involve the construction of 10,000 sf of commercial and retail space, the site would be fully developed with a subterranean parking structure. Hydrology impacts related to construction and operation of Alternative 3 would be the same as those identified for the proposed project as the same building footprint would be developed with similar impervious surfaces. All project-specific mitigation measures and code requirements related to hydrology and water quality would apply to this alternative. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Land Use

Implementation of this Alternative would result in land use effects that are nearly identical to the proposed project, as the introduction of new land uses and land use intensification would occur on-site. The overall number of residential units would remain the same as identified for the proposed project, with the only significant difference being the elimination of 10,000 sf of retail uses. As identified for the proposed project, this Alternative would not change land use patterns in a manner that would divide an established community and would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plans. As currently exists, this Alternative would not be allowed under the existing General Plan zoning, which identifies the site for commercial use. However, this Alternative would involve re-designating the site for residential use, similar to what is proposed under the proposed project. This would include a general plan amendment, a zoning map amendment, and a zoning text amendment. Therefore, this Alternative would not conflict with land use policies established by the City, and would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Noise

Demolition of existing structures and construction of a new residential facility would occur under Alternative 3. Construction noise impacts would be similar to the proposed project because demolition activities and construction at the site would still occur. The overall length of construction could be reduced due to the smaller overall size of Alternative 3. While construction noise could be a nuisance to nearby sensitive uses, compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance would ensure that construction noise impacts remain less than significant. Implementation of identified mitigation measures would reduce construction noise impacts, which would be temporary. The elimination of 10,000 sf of retail use as part of this Alternative would reduce the number of vehicle trips generated, as the only significant traffic would be generated by residents and visitors. As such, operational noise impacts due to additional vehicle trips and increased human activity at the site would be slightly less than the proposed project. Impacts to noise generated by residential uses such as mechanical equipment (HVAC) would be similar to the proposed project. Vibration associated with construction of this Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact as the nearest sensitive receptor (Golden West College) would be located at least 160 feet from the project site, similar to the proposed project. Overall, noise impacts anticipated under this

Alternative would be similar to, but slightly less severe than, the proposed project, and would be less than significant.

Population and Housing

Alternative 3 would result in the development of 440 residential units, identical to the number of units identified for the proposed project. Once fully occupied, the population increase as a result of Alternative 3 is anticipated to be 1,060 residents, assuming 2.41 persons per unit (see Population and Housing Section 4.10). This increase in population would be identical to that identified for the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in a similar impact to the proposed project with respect to population and housing, and would be less than significant.

Public Services

Implementation of this Alternative would not result in additional impacts to public services beyond those identified for the proposed project. Fire protection could be adequately provided by existing services and statutory requirements, and this impact would be less than significant, as identified for the proposed project. Additional demands on police personnel as a result of implementing this Alternative would not be substantial. The ratio of population to police officers would remain the same as identified for the proposed project, and this Alternative does not include any unique uses or features requiring substantial police service. Without commercial establishments on the project site (under this Alternative), the need for police services may be less than required under the proposed project. Mitigation measures MM4.11-1 and MM4.11-2 would apply to this Alternative, reducing impacts to a less-than-significant level. Impacts on schools as a result of the population increase would be identical to the proposed project, and mitigation measures MM4.11-3 and MM4.11-4 would ensure that this impact remains less than significant.

Recreation

Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in 440 residential units, generating an estimated population of 1,060 persons (see Population and Housing Section 4.10). Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would implement mitigation measure MM4.12-1, which would require the Applicant to pay all applicable open space and park fees to the City. As the Alternative would be similar to the proposed project in terms of recreational uses and needs, impacts would remain less than significant, as identified for the proposed project.

Transportation/Traffic

Implementation of this Alternative would eliminate the 10,000 sf of retail space proposed for the project, while keeping the 440 residential units as identified for the proposed project. As a result, traffic and parking generated by operation of Alternative 3 could be slightly less than that identified for the proposed project. However, the retail uses proposed under The Ripcurl Project are generally neighborhood-serving uses intended to create pedestrian traffic for the on-site residents and nearby Golden West College students/faculty. Actual vehicular traffic generated by the commercial uses is less

than 10 percent of the overall future traffic volumes as can be seen by referring to the trip generation summary below in Table 6-1.

Table 6-1 Alternative 3 Trip Generation Summary							
<i>Alternative</i>	<i>AM Peak Hour</i>			<i>PM Peak Hour</i>			ADT
	<i>In</i>	<i>Out</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>In</i>	<i>Out</i>	<i>Total</i>	
Proposed Project	42	162	204	155	91	246	2,640
Alternative 3	39	160	199	146	81	227	2,425

SOURCE: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. Memo Re: Ripcurl Project Alternatives, June 13, 2008.

With respect to traffic impacts, the PM peak hour inbound volume is most critical. As shown in Section 4.13 Transportation/Traffic, the proposed project contributes 1.09 percent to the intersection capacity utilization (ICU) deficiency at the I-405 ramps at Center Avenue. In order to reduce the significance of the impact, a reduction of greater than nine percent would be required. When the actual project impact trips are calculated by deducting trips generated by existing uses from the total project trip generation, the inbound hour volumes compare as follows:

Table 6-2 PM Peak Hour Inbound Project Trips		
	<i>Volume</i>	<i>Percent Reduction</i>
Proposed Project	120	--
Alternative 3	111	-7%

SOURCE: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. Memo Re: Ripcurl Project Alternatives, June 13, 2008.

Based on these reductions, Alternative 3 would result in a seven percent reduction which would not reduce the project impact below the significance level of 1.00 percent. Therefore, all mitigation measures and City requirements identified for the proposed project would apply to Alternative 3; however, similar to the proposed project, the impacted intersection (I-405 Freeway Southbound ramps at Center Avenue) is owned by Caltrans and mitigation therefore, cannot be guaranteed. Therefore, impacts relating to transportation and traffic would be similar to the proposed project, and would be significant and unavoidable.

Utilities and Service Systems

Implementation of this Alternative would result in utility impacts that are similar to, but slightly less than, the proposed project. For water, Alternative 3 would eliminate the use of 5,550 gallons per day (gpd), as there would be no commercial component for the Alternative. All other factors are assumed to remain the same, including the estimated 7,000 sf of office uses that would be used for the residential leasing office. Therefore, as shown in Table 6-3, water requirements for Alternative 3 would be an estimated 48,400 gpd. This would result in a slightly lower overall demand than the proposed project, and a less-than-significant impact with respect to water needs. Further, Alternative 3 would result in a less-than-significant impact with respect to the need for new or expanded water treatment facilities, similar to the proposed project.

Table 6-3 Water Demand for Alternative 3

<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Proposed Amount</i>	<i>Capita per DU</i>	<i>Demand Factor</i>	<i>Water Demand (gpd)</i>
Residential—studio apts	151 du	1.2	70 gpcd	12,684
Residential—1 bedroom	190 du	1.5	70 gpcd	19,950
Residential—2 bedroom	88 du	2.2	70 gpcd	13,552
Residential - live-work lofts	11 du	1.2	70 gpcd	924
Residential TOTAL	440 DU	1.5	70 gpcd	47,110
Offices	7,000 sf		0.15 gpd/sf	1,050
Irrigation	.055 acre		0.01 gpd/sf	240
Total Demand				48,400

SOURCE: PBS&J 2008 Wet Utilities Technical Study.

For wastewater impacts, Alternative 3 would result in similar, but slightly lower impacts as compared to the proposed project. The Alternative would eliminate 10,000 sf of retail, which would reduce the overall amount of wastewater generated from the project by approximately 5,900 gpd. As shown in Table 6-4, Alternative 3 would result in an estimated sewer flow of approximately 63,000 gpd. Therefore, Alternative 3 would result in similar, but slightly lower impacts related to wastewater and would have a less-than-significant impact.

Table 6-4 Estimated Sewer Flow for Alternative 3

<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Proposed Amount</i>	<i>Demand Factor</i>	<i>Sewer Flow (gpd)</i>
Residential	440 du	140 gpd/DU	61,600
Commercial/Office	7,000 sf	0.2 gpd/sf	1,400
Total			63,000 gpd

SOURCE: PBS&J 2008 Wet Utilities Technical Study

Alternative 3 would reduce the overall amount of solid waste generated at the project site. Utilizing the solid waste generation rate of 0.006 lbs/sf/day, the reduction of 10,000 sf of commercial uses would result in a corresponding decrease of approximately 60 pounds of trash per day. Therefore, Alternative 3 is anticipated to generate 1,802 pounds of solid waste per day (see Table 4.14-9). This would be similar to, although less than, the proposed project and would result in a less-than-significant impact. For energy, Alternative 3 would require similar, although slightly lower energy resources than the proposed project, due to the elimination of 10,000 sf of retail space. This would reduce the project's overall demand for electricity and natural gas compared to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to energy resources would be similar to, but slightly lower than, the proposed project. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

■ Attainment of Project Objectives

Implementation of Alternative 3 would satisfy some, but not all of the identified project objectives. Under this Alternative, 440 residential units would be developed on the project site. This would satisfy all objectives related to the development of dense residential uses within close proximity to transit, schools, and regional activities. However, objectives related to the creation of a mixed-use development with retail uses would not be met. One example of such an objective is to enliven the area and provide pedestrian friendly retail to both students of Golden West College and the residential uses at The Ripcurl project.

This Alternative would not fulfill all of the project objectives identified for the project. While this Alternative may result in a slight reduction of most environmental impacts, it would not necessarily reduce the significance of the impacts below those of the proposed project.

6.3.4 Alternative 4: Reduced Project—Option 2

■ Description

This Alternative assumes a reduced intensity of development for both the residential and retail components. Under this Alternative, 385 residential units would be developed on the project site, a reduction of 55 total units from the proposed project. These units would include: 50 studio units, 135 one-bedroom units, 185 two-bedroom units, and 15 live-work lofts. Additionally, Alternative 4 would reduce the amount of retail space by 1,500 sf, to a total of 8,500 sf of retail. The estimated 7,000 sf residential leasing office would remain. Therefore, the project's overall size would be reduced by approximately 1,500 sf of retail space and 55 residential units, or more than a 12 percent reduction in residential uses and a 15 percent reduction in commercial uses when compared to the proposed project.

Site configuration could be modified to allow the residential units to better fit the site with the reduction of retail space at the ground level. All features associated with the proposed project would be included as part of this Alternative, including an outdoor pool and spa area, fire pit, and movie projection area as well as an indoor fitness center, business center, conference room, and clubhouse. Primary access to the site would be similar to what has been identified for the proposed project. Primary parking access for the residential portion of the project would be from Center Avenue, with primary parking for the retail portion of the project coming from Gothard Street.

Alternative 4 would target the same three populations groups as the proposed project would: (1) Young Professionals, (2) the Golden West College community, and (3) Progressives. Young professionals consist of childless couples and singles who work in Huntington Beach, North Orange County, and South LA County who would be drawn to amenities provided in the proposed neighboring Village at Bella Terra project, the surrounding neighborhood and the project itself. The Golden West College community consists of students, teachers and administrators associated with the neighboring college who would like to take advantage of new living options close to campus. Progressives consist of people who would utilize transit for work and who would appreciate the green features of the Alternative.

■ Potential Impacts

Aesthetics

This Alternative would result in development of a mixed-use residential and retail development of similar size and massing as the proposed project. This Alternative would reduce the number of residential units by 55 and reduce the amount of retail space by 1,500 sf. No scenic vistas would be impacted as a result of the Alternative. This Alternative would demolish the existing buildings on-site, which would be replaced by the new development. Although 55 units would be eliminated, the new structures on-site would be four to six stories tall. The buildings would likely be reconfigured in a new layout but the overall aesthetic effect would remain the same. The Alternative would be taller than the existing on-site structures and would result in changes to the aesthetic character of the site. The reduction in this Alternative's size could result in a reconfiguration that could provide reduced building heights, increased setbacks from Center Avenue or Gothard Street, or increased common open space areas within the project site. Regardless of the potential visual reconfiguration that could occur, the overall size and design of this Alternative would be in keeping with the surrounding developments, namely the existing Bella Terra Mall to the east. All parking and utilities required under this Alternative would be screened from public view, similar to the proposed project and the color and architectural design would be approved by the City. In addition, because structures under this Alternative would be similar in terms of increased height, this Alternative would cast similar shadows on adjacent structures as compared to the proposed project. As such, visual quality impacts under this Alternative would be similar to the proposed project and would remain less than significant.

Impacts associated with light and glare would also be similar to the proposed project, because interior and exterior artificial light would be necessary, and exterior-building materials would be identical to the proposed project. The only difference would be a slight reduction in the number of units and a reduction in retail space, which could slightly reduce the amount of exterior lighting required for the project site. These impacts would remain less than significant, similar to the proposed project.

Overall, aesthetic impacts anticipated under this Alternative would be similar to the proposed project and would be less than significant.

Air Quality

Implementation of this Alternative would require demolition of on-site structures and construction of residential units and commercial retail establishments, similar to the proposed project. Although the construction impacts of Alternative 4 would be less than that identified for the proposed project, the City requirements and mitigation measures identified for the proposed project would apply to Alternative 4 as well. This Alternative would reduce the number of residential units by 55, while reducing the overall amount of retail space by 1,500 sf of retail space. As such, the amount of air pollutant emissions (i.e., CO, VOC, NO_x, SO_x, and PM₁₀) generated by motor vehicles and daily operation of the site would be similar to, but slightly less than the proposed project and SCAQMD thresholds, and would be less than significant.

Like the proposed project, construction activities associated with this alternative would include grading and compaction of the on-site soil, building construction, application of architectural coating to the interior and exterior of the new structures, and application of new asphalt. Compliance with the identified City requirements and implementation of identified mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level. As the footprint of development would be smaller, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

Construction of this alternative would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations due to project-generated toxic air contaminants. Although construction activities typically generate emissions of toxic air contaminants (e.g., diesel emissions, fumes from paint and solvents), neither the amount of these emissions or the location of such emissions would result in substantial exposure for sensitive receptors in the project vicinity. This impact would be less than significant.

Construction activities associated with this alternative would not generate emissions that would result in an exceedance of localized significance thresholds established by the SCAQMD. This impact would be less than significant. As less development would take place under this alternative, impacts would be less than under the proposed project.

Similar to the proposed project, operation of the uses prescribed under this alternative would not generate emissions that would exceed SCAQMD thresholds. As the development would be less intense than the proposed project and would likely generate lesser traffic volumes, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

Operation of this alternative would generate increased local traffic volumes but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial localized carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations. Although traffic volumes would increase beyond existing levels at local intersections, the ARB has projected reduced future vehicle emissions factors for CO resulting from anticipated improvements in emissions technologies, and localized CO emissions would not exceed applicable federal or state standards. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Construction and operation of this alternative would not create objectionable odors, from either construction activities or daily operation affecting a substantial number of people, as the distance between the site and adjacent land uses would ensure that any such odors would dissipate. This impact would be less than significant.

Similar to the proposed project and based on the other known area projects, construction and operation of this alternative would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the region is in nonattainment under applicable federal or State ambient air quality standards. As the development would be less intense than the proposed project and would likely generate lesser traffic volumes, impacts would be less than the proposed project.

Overall, air quality impacts anticipated under this Alternative would be similar to, but slightly less than the proposed project.

Biological Resources

Biological impacts under Alternative 4 would be nearly identical to those identified for the proposed project. No impacts would occur with respect to riparian habitats, sensitive species, or conflict with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plans or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plans. The project site is located within a fully urbanized and developed City, and does not contain a wildlife corridor or other biological resource of importance to the region. Therefore, similar to the proposed project, Alternative 4 would result in no impacts for these thresholds. Implementation of Alternative 4 could have a direct or indirect impact on habitat loss in the area, specifically for nesting birds. This is similar to the proposed project. However, the implementation of the identified mitigation measures (MM4.3-1 for the proposed project) would ensure that this impact remains less than significant. Therefore, Alternative 4 would have a similar impact as the proposed project with respect to habitat loss. Additionally, Alternative 4 would not interfere with or impact the implementation of any City, State, or federal policies or ordinances that would apply to biological resources, similar to the proposed project. Overall, the impacts of this Alternative on biological resources would be similar to the impacts of the proposed project and would be less than significant.

Cultural Resources

Impacts relating to cultural resources under Alternative 4 would be nearly identical to those identified for the proposed project. Under the Alternative, the entire project site would be graded, which excavation occurring for construction of the underground parking levels. Construction activities under Alternative 4 would be required to follow all policies of the General Plan and Municipal Code with regard to cultural resources that may be found on-site. As such, impacts to cultural resources would result in a less-than-significant impact, similar to the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative could expose people and/or structures to potentially substantial adverse effects resulting from strong seismic groundshaking or seismic-related ground failure. All impacts associated with geological and soil impacts that were identified for the proposed project would also apply to Alternative 4. All construction of the residential units and retail space would follow established policies and codes. The risks to people and structures would not be increased regardless of the size of the development, as adherence to these regulations would assure seismic safety to the greatest extent possible. Therefore, impacts due to seismic activity would be less than significant. This alternative could result in soil erosion, but would not result in the loss of topsoil. As part of the project, a site-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, which is part of the NPDES Municipal General Permit, would be prepared for development under this alternative. Compliance with applicable requirements would ensure that this impact remain less than significant. Therefore, impacts associated with geology and soils would be similar to the proposed project and would result in a less-than-significant impact.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Although the intensity of development under Alternative 4 would be slightly less than that identified for the proposed project, potential impacts with respect to hazards and hazardous materials would be similar. Construction of Alternative 4 would involve the use of hazardous materials, specifically in the form of diesel fuel. Project construction could expose construction workers to significant health and safety hazards through earthmoving activities that could result in the release of hazardous materials to the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions. Implementation of the identified mitigation measures would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, similar to the proposed project. Operation of the residential uses and retail space for Alternative 4 could involve the use of hazardous materials in the form of basic cleaning materials and landscaping chemicals. However, this use would be slightly reduced from the proposed project. Overall, Alternative 4 would result in a similar impact with respect to hazards and hazardous materials as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Alternative 4 would result in nearly identical impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality. While the overall size of Alternative 4 is slightly reduced when compared to the proposed project, the development would take up the entire 3.8 acre site. Similar impacts would result from implementation of Alternative 4 compared to the proposed project because similar construction and operational activities would still occur. Although the site configuration could be modified to allow the residential units to better fit the site with the reduction of retail space at the ground level, similar impervious surfaces would likely occur. All project-specific mitigation measures and code requirements related to hydrology and water quality would apply to this alternative. Therefore, impacts would remain less than significant.

Land Use

Implementation of this Alternative would result in land use effects that are nearly identical to the proposed project, as the introduction of new land uses and land use intensification would occur on site. The overall number of residential units would be slightly reduced from the units identified for the proposed project, while the amount of retail space would be reduced by 1,500 sf. As identified for the proposed project, the Alternative would not change land use patterns in a manner that would divide an established community and would not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plans. As currently exists, the Alternative (as well as the proposed project) would not be allowed under the existing General Plan zoning, which identifies the site as general commercial. However, the Alternative would involve re-designating the site for mixed-use residential and retail uses, similar to what is proposed under the proposed project. This would include a general plan amendment, a zoning map amendment, and a zoning text amendment. Therefore, after implementation of the amendments, the Alternative would not conflict with land use policies established by the City, resulting in a less-than-significant impact.

Noise

Demolition of existing structures and construction of a new residential facility would occur under Alternative 4. Construction noise impacts would be similar to the proposed project because demolition activities and construction at the site would still occur. The overall length of construction could be slightly reduced due to the overall reduction in retail space and residential units. While construction noise could be a nuisance to nearby sensitive uses, compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance would ensure that construction noise impacts would be less than significant. Implementation of identified mitigation measures would reduce construction noise impacts, which would be temporary. The reduction of 1,500 sf of retail space and the elimination of 55 residential units as part of this Alternative could reduce the number of vehicle trips generated. As such, operational noise impacts due to additional vehicle trips and increased human activity at the site would be slightly less than the proposed project. Impacts to noise generated by residential and retail uses such as mechanical equipment (HVAC) would be similar to the proposed project. Vibration associated with construction of this Alternative would result in a less-than-significant impact as the nearest sensitive receptor (Golden West College) would be located at least 160 feet from the project site. Overall, noise impacts anticipated under this Alternative would be similar to the proposed project, and would be less than significant.

Population and Housing

Alternative 4 would result in the development of 385 residential units, which is a reduction of 55 units compared to the proposed project. Once fully occupied, the population increase as a result of Alternative 4 is anticipated to be 928 residents, assuming 2.41 persons per unit (see Population and Housing Section 4.10). This increase in population would result in 132 less residents than the number identified for the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative 4 would result in a similar, although slightly less, impact compared to the proposed project with respect to population and housing, and would be less than significant.

Public Services

Alternative 4 would result in similar, although slightly less, impacts with respect to public service resources. Fire protection could be adequately provided by existing services and statutory requirements, and this impact would be less than significant, similar to the proposed project. Additional demands on police personnel from this Alternative would not be substantial. The ratio of population to police officers would be slightly less than what was identified for the proposed project, and this Alternative does not include any unique uses or features requiring substantial police service. Mitigation measures MM4.11-1 and MM 4.11-2 (identified for the proposed project) would apply to this Alternative, reducing impacts to police resources to a less-than-significant level. Impacts on schools as a result of the population increase would be slightly less than what was identified for the proposed project, and mitigation measures MM4.11-3 and MM4.11-4 would ensure this impact remains less than significant.

Recreation

Similar to the proposed project, this Alternative would result in 385 residential units, generating an estimated population of 928 persons (based on the 2.41 person per unit ratio for the City of Huntington Beach, Population and Housing). Similar to the proposed project, the Alternative would implement MM4.12-1, which would require the Applicant to pay all applicable open space fees to the City. As the Alternative would be similar to the proposed project in terms of recreational uses and needs, impacts would remain less than significant, as identified for the proposed project.

Transportation/Traffic

Implementation of this Alternative would reduce the square-footage of retail space proposed for the project (to 8,500 sf), while reducing the number of residential units from 440 to 385. As a result, traffic volumes generated by operation of Alternative 4 would be less than identified for the proposed project. The trip generation for Alternative 4 compared to the trip generation for the proposed project is shown in Table 6-5.

Table 6-5 Trip Generation for Alternative 4							
Alternative	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour			ADT
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
Proposed Project	42	162	204	155	91	246	2,640
Alternative 4	37	142	179	136	80	216	2,305

SOURCE: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. Memo Re: Ripcurl Project Alternatives, June 13, 2008.

With respect to traffic impacts, the PM peak hour inbound volume is most critical. As shown in Section 4.13 Transportation/Traffic, the proposed project contributes 1.09 percent to the intersection capacity utilization (ICU) deficiency at the I-405 ramps at Center Avenue. In order to reduce the significance of the impact, a reduction of greater than 9 percent would be required. When the actual project impact trips are calculated by deducting trips generated by existing uses from the total project trip generation, the inbound hour volumes compare as follows:

Table 6-6 PM Peak Hour Inbound Project Trips		
	Volume	Percent Reduction
Proposed Project	120	--
Alternative 4	101	-16%

SOURCE: Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. Memo Re: Ripcurl Project Alternatives, June 13, 2008.

Based on these reductions, Alternative 4 would reduce the project impact below the significance level of 1.00 percent because it would result in a reduction of 16 percent. The 12 percent reduction in residential uses and 15 percent reduction in commercial retail uses would eliminate the significant impact at the Caltrans-owned intersection of the I-405 Freeway Southbound ramps at Center Avenue. Furthermore, all mitigation measures and City requirements identified for the proposed project would apply to this

Alternative. Therefore, impacts related to transportation and traffic would be less than those identified for the proposed project, and would be less than significant.

Utilities and Service Systems

As shown in Table 6-7, Alternative 4 would require the use of approximately 54,740 gpd, which is approximately 790 gpd more than the estimated water demand for the proposed project (53,950 gpd). Although the overall residential unit count would be reduced, the water demand is slightly larger for this Alternative due to the increased number of two-bedroom units proposed. Similar water conservation and efficiency efforts would be required under this Alternative, including CR4.14-1, and adequate conveyance infrastructure would be required. No new or expanded water treatment facilities would be required under this Alternative as the remaining capacities at both the Diemer Filtration Plant and the Jensen Filtration Plant is more than sufficient to handle the slight increase in water demand from this Alternative as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative 4 would result in slightly increased water demands when compared with the proposed project but would be expected to maintain less-than-significant impacts with respect to water needs.

Table 6-7 Water Demand for Alternative 4

<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Proposed Amount</i>	<i>Capita per DU</i>	<i>Demand Factor</i>	<i>Water Demand (gpd)</i>
Residential—studio apts	50 du	1.2	70 gpcd	4,200
Residential—1 bedroom	135 du	1.5	70 gpcd	14,175
Residential—2 bedroom	185 du	2.2	70 gpcd	28,490
Residential—live-work lofts	15 du	1.2	70 gpcd	1,260
<i>Residential TOTAL</i>	<i>385 DU</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>70 gpcd</i>	<i>48,125</i>
Commercial/Restaurants	3,000 sf		1.5 gpd/sf	4,500
Commercial/Retail	5,500 sf		0.15 gpd/sf	825
Offices	7,000 sf		0.15 gpd/sf	1,050
Irrigation	0.055 acre		0.01 gpd/sf	240
<i>Total Demand</i>				<i>54,740</i>

SOURCE: PBS&J 2008 Wet Utilities Technical Study.

For wastewater impacts, Alternative 4 would result in similar impacts as compared to the proposed project. The Alternative would eliminate reduce the number of dwelling units by 55 and reduce the amount of retail space by 1,500 sf, which would reduce the overall amount of wastewater generated by approximately 8,000 gpd, as compared to the proposed project. Therefore, Alternative 4 would result in similar, but slightly lower impacts relating to wastewater and would have a less-than-significant impact.

Table 6-8 Estimated Sewer Flow for Alternative 4			
<i>Land Use</i>	<i>Proposed Amount</i>	<i>Demand Factor</i>	<i>Water Demand (gpd)</i>
Residential	385 du	140 gpd/DU	53,900
Commercial/Office	7,000 sf	0.2 gpd/sf	1,400
Commercial/Restaurant	3,000 sf	1.5 gpd/sf	4,500
Commercial/Retail	5,500 sf	0.2 gpd/sf	1,100
Total			60,900 gpd
SOURCE: PBS&J 2008 Wet Utilities Technical Study			

The generation of solid waste for Alternative 4 would be similar to, although less than, the amount estimated for the proposed project. The reduction in residential units, from 440 to 385, would result in an estimated 1,540 pounds per day of solid waste (assuming a generation factor of 4 lbs/day). The reduction of approximately 1,500 sf of retail space would result in an estimated 93 pounds of solid waste generated per day (see Table 4.14-9). Therefore, the total solid waste generated by Alternative 4 would be approximately 1,633 lbs/day. When compared to the proposed project, these generation rates would be similar to, although approximately 229 lbs/day less than, the amount anticipated to be generated by the proposed project (1,862 lbs/day). This would be a less-than-significant impact.

For energy, Alternative 4 would require similar, although slightly lower energy resources than the proposed project, due to the elimination of 1,500 sf of retail space and 55 dwelling units. This would reduce the Project's overall demand for electricity and natural gas compared to the proposed project. Therefore, impacts related to energy resources would be similar to, but slightly lower than the proposed project. This would be a less-than-significant impact.

■ Attainment of Project Objectives

Implementation of Alternative 4 would satisfy all of the identified project objectives. Under this alternative, 385 residential units and 8,500 sf of retail space would be developed on the project site. This would satisfy all objectives relating to developing dense residential uses within close proximity to transit, schools, and regional activities while offering close proximity to retail opportunities.

Implementation of this Alternative would reduce the significant and unavoidable traffic impact caused by the proposed project to a less-than-significant level.

6.4 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

Table 6-9 (Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project) provides a summary of the comparison of alternatives to the proposed project.

Table 6-9 Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Project

<i>Environmental Issue Area</i>	<i>No Project/No Development</i>	<i>No Project/Continuation of Uses Allowed by the Existing General Plan</i>	<i>Reduced Alternative 3</i>	<i>Reduced Alternative 4</i>
Aesthetics	–	–	–	=
Air Quality	–	–	–	–
Biological Resources	–	–	=	=
Cultural Resources	–	–	=	=
Geology and Soils	–	–	=	=
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	–	–	=	=
Hydrology and Water Quality	–	–	=	=
Land Use	–	–	=	=
Noise	–	–	–	–
Population and Housing	–	–	=	–
Public Services	–	–	–	=
Recreation	N/A	N/A	=	=
Transportation	–	–	–	–
Utilities	–	–	–	–

(–) = Impacts considered to be less when compared with the proposed project.

(+) = Impacts considered to be greater when compared with the proposed project.

(=) = Impacts considered to be equal or similar to the proposed project.

6.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The No Project/No Development Alternative would be environmentally superior to the proposed project on the basis of the minimization or avoidance of physical environmental impacts. However, the CEQA Guidelines require that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, “the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives” (15126.6[e][2]). Alternative 3 results in slightly reduced impacts compared to the proposed project but it would not necessarily reduce the significance of the impacts below those of the proposed project. Alternative 4, however, would obtain all project objectives and would eliminate the significant and unavoidable traffic impact caused by the proposed project. Therefore, the Reduced Alternative 4 would be considered the environmentally superior alternative, as summarized above in Table 6-1.

6.6 REFERENCES

Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. City of Huntington Beach Ripcurl Traffic Impact Analysis. July 2008.

Austin-Foust Associates, Inc. Memo Re: Ripcurl Project Alternatives, June 13, 2008.

PBS&J, Wet Utilities Technical Study For the Ripcurl Project. 2008.